


Under the Paperwork Reduction Act of 1995, no persons are required to respond to a collection of information unless it displays a valid OMB control number.

PRE-APPEAL BRIEF REQUEST FOR REVIEW		Docket Number (Optional) NVDA/P001152	
I hereby certify that this correspondence is being deposited with the United States Postal Service with sufficient postage as first class mail in an envelope addressed to "Mail Stop AF, Commissioner for Patents, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450" [37 CFR 1.8(a)] on _____ Signature _____ Typed or printed Name _____	Application Number 10/811,641	Filed March 29, 2004	
	First Named Inventor Walter E. Donovan		
	Art Unit 2628	Examiner Hau H. Nguyen	
<p>Applicant requests review of the final rejection in the above-identified application. No amendments are being filed with this request.</p> <p>This request is being filed with a notice of appeal.</p> <p>The review is requested for the reason(s) stated on the attached sheet(s). Note: No more than five (5) pages may be provided.</p> <p>I am the</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> applicant/inventor.</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> assignee of record of the entire interest. See 37 CFR 3.71. Statement under 37 CFR 3.73(b) is enclosed. (Form PTO/SB/96)</p> <p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> attorney or agent of record. Registration number 52,371</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> attorney or agent acting under 37 CFR 1.34. Registration number _____</p> <p> _____ Signature</p> <p>Stephanie Winner _____ Typed or printed name</p> <p>713-623-4844 _____ Telephone number</p> <p>May 14, 2007 _____ Date</p>			
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> *Total of 1 forms are submitted.			

This collection of information is required by 35 U.S.C. 132. The information is required to obtain or retain a benefit by the public which is to file (and by the USPTO to process) an application. Confidentiality is governed by 35 U.S.C. 122 and 37 CFR 1.11, 1.14 and 41.6. This collection is estimated to take 12 minutes to complete, including gathering, preparing, and submitting the completed application form to the USPTO. Time will vary depending upon the individual case. Any comments on the amount of time you require to complete this form and/or suggestions for reducing this burden, should be sent to the Chief Information Officer, U.S. Patent and Trademark Office, U.S. Department of Commerce, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450. DO NOT SEND FEES OR COMPLETED FORMS TO THIS ADDRESS. SEND TO: Mail Stop AF, Commissioner for Patents, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450.

If you need assistance in completing the form, call 1-800-PTO-9199 and select option 2.

IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

In re Application of:	§	Confirmation No.: 2379
Walter E. Donovan	§	
	§	Group Art Unit: 2628
Serial No.: 10/811,641	§	
	§	Examiner: Nguyen, Hau H.
Filed: March 29, 2004	§	
	§	
For: METHOD AND APPARATUS	§	Customer No.: 26290
FOR USING NON-POWER OF	§	
TWO DIMENSION TEXTURE	§	
MAPS	§	

MAIL STOP AF
Commissioner for Patents
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

PRE-APPEAL CONFERENCE BRIEF

In conjunction with the Pre-Appeal Brief Request for Review filed herewith, Applicants request a Panel review of the Final Rejection in this matter. Although the remarks herein are focused on a specific factual issue raised by the rejection, nothing in this paper is meant to limit the scope of any arguments, either factual or legal, that Applicants may later present in a full appeal brief.

QUESTIONS FOR REVIEW

The Examiner has rejected pending claims 5-7, 10-17, and 19-22 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Bentz (U.S. Patent No. 7,057,623) in view of lourcha et al (U.S. Patent No. 6,304,268). The Examiner has also rejected pending claims 8-9, and 18 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Bentz in view of lourcha in further view of U.S. Patent No. 6,304,268 to Taylor et al. The Examiner's rejections based on the combination of Bentz and lourcha are respectfully traversed.

Independent claims 5 and 15 include limitations directed to a reduced portion of a normalized texture map coordinate. The normalized texture map coordinate ranges in value from 0 to 1 as stated in paragraph [0025] of the Applicant's original specification and as recited in claims 5 and 15. A reduced portion of the normalized texture map coordinate is obtained, as described in paragraphs [0032-0033] and Figure 3C of the Applicant's original specification. The reduced portion of the normalized texture map coordinate is scaled by an LOD dimension to produce an unnormalized texture map coordinate. Importantly, the unnormalized texture map coordinate is a non-negative value that has a value between 0 and the LOD dimension - 1, as recited in claims 1 and 15. These parameters guarantee that the unnormalized texture map coordinate lies within the texture map.

The Examiner relies on Bentz for teaching of all of the limitations of claims 5 and 15, except for the LOD dimension. In particular, the Examiner states that Bentz teaches that the normalized texture map is already reduced. As clearly stated in col. 4, lines 54-69 of Bentz, "Normalized texel coordinates correspond to the relative position of a texel in a texture map having dimensions between 0 and 1. That is, the width or the height of a texture map is represented over a range of [0:1] (i.e., a range greater than or equal to zero, but less than 1)." Therefore, the normalized texel coordinates of Bentz are equivalent to the normalized texel coordinates recited in claims 5 and 15.

Applicant respectfully contends that Bentz does not teach or suggest the limitation of producing a reduced portion of a normalized texture map coordinate. In sharp contrast, Bentz teaches scaling the normalized texture map coordinates to produce unnormalized texture map coordinates without obtaining a reduced portion of each normalized texture map coordinate. As described in col. 4, lines 59-63, Bentz, "The normalized coordinates are scaled by multiplying the normalized texel coordinates by the dimensions of the texture map so that the width and height are represented over a range of [0:tex_size.sub.width[and [0:tex_size.sub.height[, respectively."

The unnormalized texture map coordinates are then modified to produce output coordinates that lie within the texture map. Specifically, the output coordinates are computed based on the sign of the unnormalized texture map coordinate, as described in col. 2, lines 27-34 of Bentz and in more detail in col. 5, line 51- col. 6, line 16 of

Bentz. Importantly, the present application obtains a reduced portion of the normalized texture map coordinate before scaling by the LOD dimension to produce an unnormalized coordinate with a non-negative value that actually lies within the texture map. The claimed method, thus, does not rely on further modifications based on a sign, like Bentz, to produce a coordinate that lies within the texture map.

Neither Iourcha nor Taylor provides any specific teachings or insight into how texture coordinate values should be produced for non-power of two texture maps. In particular, none of these references teaches or suggests a texture map coordinate computation unit that is configured to receive a non-power of two LOD and compute unnormalized texture map coordinates for a non-power of two texture map using a portion of the normalized texture map coordinates, as recited in claims 5 and 15.

For these reasons, the combination of Bentz, Iourcha, and Taylor fails to teach or suggest each and every limitation of claims 5 and 15. Therefore, claims 5 and 15 are patentable over the combination of Bentz, Iourcha and Taylor. Since claims 6-14 and claims 18-22 depend from claims 5 and 15, respectively, these claims are also patentable over the combination of Bentz, Iourcha, and Taylor.

Additionally, claim 15 was amended to include the limitations of canceled claims 16 and 17. Therefore, amended claim 15 does not raise a new issue.

In view of these clear distinctions, reconsideration and allowance of all the claims is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,



Stephanie Winner
Registration No. 52,371
PATTERSON & SHERIDAN, L.L.P.
3040 Post Oak Blvd. Suite 1500
Houston, TX 77056
Telephone: (713) 623-4844
Facsimile: (713) 623-4846
Agent for Applicant